DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 137 EA 027 364

AUTHOR Daresh, John C.
TITLE Mentoring of Beginning School Principals and Teachers: Solution to a Dilemma.
PUB DATE Jan 96
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Association of South Africa (Pochefstroom, South Africa, January 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Leadership; Leadership Training; Management Development; *Mentors; *Professional Development; *School Administration

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies four common dilemmas that educators face across the globe: (1) meeting political demands for increased effectiveness and productivity; (2) providing education in ways that are consistent with the realities of diversity; (3) maintaining a focus on moral and ethical practice; and (4) determining the proper balance between individual rights and collective social order. The paper considers how effective educational leadership might be of value in addressing these issues. It presents the concept of "spiritual leadership," in which the administrator sees with the "two eyes" of management and leadership. Spiritual leadership might be allowed to flourish in educational settings through engaging in reflection on one's practice, pursuing academic learning, and developing a personal belief platform. The potential of mentoring as a useful strategy for facilitating spiritual leadership is highlighted. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 137

MENTORING OF BEGINNING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS: SOLUTION TO A DILEMMA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Daresh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper Presented by

John C. Daresh
Professor of Educational Administration
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61790
USA

When I was first invited to speak at this Conference several months ago, I had many reactions. The first few were of a highly personal and thankful sort. First, I was delighted to learn that I would be able to spend some time with a number of friends and colleagues from this country with whom I have had the pleasure of working for several years. I have gotten to know many educators from South Africa, but my contact has always been at research conferences and other meetings in the United States, England, or on one occasion, Israel. In particular, I wish to express my appreciation to the coordinating committee who have worked so hard to bring me to South Africa. And so, my first feeling has been one of great appreciation to many of you for this truly wonderful opportunity.

My second feeling has been one of wide-eyed tourist-like anticipation of this trip. This is my first travel beyond North America or Europe. Over the past several years, I have been fortunate enough to travel extensively on both of those continents. But the prospect of traveling here to Africa to see this amazing and wonderful part of the world is something which I never dreamed would have been available at any time in my life. Again, the emotion I have felt is one of anticipation and appreciation, and I will continue to feel this way throughout my very short stay.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 027 367

Also, being able to leave places with snow and below zero temperatures at this time of the year is never a chore.

The third reaction is related to the majority of my time with you today, and also the primary purpose for this trip. This reaction is not as easy to describe as were the first two issues because this reaction may be somewhat disturbing, or at least disquieting. As I was informed many months ago, the theme for the Conference this year deals with discovering ways to deal with dilemmas facing the educational world today. I was also asked to speak to you about topics which are near and dear to my heart, namely the importance of using mentoring relationships as a way to assist beginning educators. My uneasiness is not prompted by the prospect of standing before you and trying to deal with dilemmas. Nor is it based on my invitation to speak about mentoring. It is, instead, the bridge that I must form and then cross in bringing these two themes together. My concern today is related to first, trying to identify the types of dilemmas that should be addressed by educators, and then, consider the use of mentoring as a potential way to deal effectively with the identified dilemmas.

It seems to me that identifying dilemmas is not a difficult task. Education today is not facing only a few well-defined problems. Instead, our concern is to delimit and decide which of an almost unbelievably long list of problems we should try to tackle first. There are no magic answers to what I have selected to spotlight as major dilemmas faced by educators, but I have identified four things that I believe serve as the foundation for many of the problems we now face as educators, both here is South Africa, and also in the United States and in other countries around the world.

1. Meeting political demands for increased effectiveness and productivity.

1. Meeting political demands for increased effectiveness and productivity.
2. Providing education in ways that is consistent with the realities of diversity.
3. Maintaining a focus on moral and ethical practice.
4. Determining the proper balance between individual rights and collective social order.

My goal today is not simply to list these four major dilemmas faced by educators and suggest directly that mentoring may be seen as a kind of magic potion that may be used to "fix" these problems. Making that claim would be contrary to a stance which I have taken for several years, namely the belief that adopting one practice or another out of context can ever be effective. Instead, I wish to think about a factor which we have not yet mentioned, namely more effective leadership, and consider that as a potential way to intervene more effectively in any of the four dilemmas I have listed. In the next 40 minutes or so, I hope to review these identified dilemmas and consider the ways in which more effective educational leadership patterns might be of some value in addressing these issues. Then, perhaps we can see if mentoring might be a useful strategy.

Let me explain a bit about my own background, what I now do, and some of the research that I have conducted with colleagues over the years. At the beginning of my professional career, I was a high school teacher (secondary schools in the United States are simply referred to in most cases as high schools and include students from the ages of about 14 to 18) and head of the foreign language department in two schools, one in a small city, and the other in the very large city of Chicago. I worked on two masters degrees, one in applied linguistics at a university in Canada, and the other degree which I completed was in educational administration at a university

the largest research universities in the US. At that point, I began my career in higher education and I have worked at universities in the states of Ohio, Colorado, and Illinois.

Over the past 17 years in higher education, I have had a couple of distinct interests in my research. I began with an interest in the improvement of secondary education, and I served as the director of a national research project which examined ways in which American high schools might become more responsive to individual student learning and developmental needs. I have continued with that interest in some ways. Recently, I served as a member of the Carnegie Foundation's Commission on the Restructuring of the American High School, and our report will be released at the end of February at the meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals in San Francisco. About ten years ago, I became increasingly interested in the issue of how schools--both high schools and primary or elementary schools-might become more effective in their efforts to promote more effective learning if leaders of those schools were more successful and effective. As you may know, the early 1980s were the years of great interest in our country in what has now been called the "Effective Schools Movement." Researchers who wanted to know why some schools seemed better than others identified early on that the single most important characteristic of an effective school is always the leadership behavior of the school principal as the primary leader. That recognition has led to numerous efforts to discover more precisely what leader behaviors are more likely to have what effects on people who work in organizations. I might also note that that search for the most appropriate leadership styles and behaviors in educational organizations have paralleled similar efforts to understand effective leadership in all kinds of organizations. As a consequence, recent years have seen the emergence

of people like Tom Peters, Warren Bennis, Burt Nanus, and others as key investigators of effective leadership approaches.

My interests and work have been tied to this rediscovery of the importance of leadership, but in a somewhat different vein. Rather than trying to determine precise leadership behaviors that are more or less effective, my interests have been tied to the issue of how we might begin to "build better leaders" in the first place, particularly for schools. As you may know, in the US, we have a long-standing tradition of believing that we may prepare people to step into formal educational management roles before they are first appointed. That preparation process takes place for the most part in university settings, in graduate schools of education. After spending anywhere from two or three to several years working as classroom teachers, aspiring school principals and others enroll in masters degree programs in educational management and proceed through a required curriculum designed to make people ready to step into their posts for the first time. After the completion of this academic learning experience which may range in overall quality from very good to very bad, those who wish to serve as school administrators must often meet other bureaucratic requirements set by each state. Tests may be required, minimum years of service as teachers might be required, and so forth. But eventually, a person will receive a license or certificate which will enable him or her to seek a position as an administrator. If a school district--of which there are 15,000 across the US--hires the person, they are a bona fide school principal. There is an underlying assumption, then, that people can be prepared to serve as educational managers before they step into that role. I mention this view and this assumption now because I believe that it has an important part in explaining who I am, what I do, and why I do what I do. I have been involved with the analysis of practices associated with the professional

development of school leaders--note that I use a term more broadly defined than simply "school administrators"---for several years. I have focused on two areas of specialization in our work. One has to do with the nature of mentoring programs for school leaders, and the other area where we have worked is related to identifying the specific kinds of skills that are needed by beginning school principals. I will speak a bit more about these issues later, but now I mention it only to help you understand more about the kinds of assumptions I make about the world of leadership and management development in schools. If one does not know about our emphasis on preservice training for school administrative positions, the research in which I have been involved for many years does not seem to fit with assumptions and views in other countries. I also wish to note an important theme that underlies my comments this morning. I do not believe that there is much sense in talking about and considering the possible adoption of mentoring without also considering the context in which educational leaders must work. What are the dilemmas that people will face out in the field? And I can only wonder if here is any sense in talking about needs of beginning teachers or principals without some attention paid to the local context and realities faced by such individuals. In short, if we do not have a vision of what we want people to do, or what they to look like, how can we talk about any approach to professional development--whether it is mentoring or some other approach--in any meaningful way?

I realize that the context and issues facing South Africa are very different than the specific problems and issues we face in the US. However, I now return to the comments I made at the outset, in the introduction of some common themes or dilemmas which might promote a more universal dialogue, even with our acknowledged differences in terms of specific issues and problems. I appreciate that, in one way, even with very different policies, traditions, and cultures

to guide us, we share some problems faced by educators and managers everywhere. There is not enough time, money, and often, energy to do what we want to do. As educators, we are all at the mercy of larger political and economic decision makers and priority setters in our worlds. I do not wish to minimize or make light of these types of concerns, for I know that without money, we cannot do even the most basic kinds of things that must be done in schools. But I wish to go beyond that level of concern, and beyond the kinds of issues that we face in our separate worlds. I have sought issues and dilemmas which may be of a more universal sort. As such, they are philosophical dilemmas from which there are no easy escapes, if escapes are possible at all. It seems to me that the four concerns I have selected--meeting political demands for increased effectiveness and productivity, providing education consistent with the realities of diversity, maintaining a focus on ethical and moral practice, and deciding balance between individual rights versus general social order--are concerns for all of us which must cause a deeper understanding and appreciation of values and beliefs on our parts as individuals. They are personal and professional issues, not simply managerial issues. As I have reviewed the aims of this Conference, I note that we are to:

1. Identify thorny educational problems
2. Seek theoretical grounding for further identifying and ultimately resolving those dilemmas
3. Identify ways to test and investigate potential solutions to the dilemmas
4. Select guidelines for implementing solutions through teaching, research, and practice

I shall try to approach the last three of these issues in my remarks, since I have, at least to now, already selected a set of four problems which I believe to be deserving the title of theoretical, philosophical, and practical dilemmas.

I would like to make a proposal to you today that, at least in part, a potential theory base from which we may look at the dilemmas I have outlined may be that of leadership. When I speak of this term, let me digress a bit to state that, from my perspective, I am not simply talking about finding managerial solutions to problems. To the contrary, I hold very tightly to a belief that there is a fundamental and distinct separation of the two terms, management and leadership. Bennis and Nanus have tried to explain this distinction in their work by noting that "Managers do things right, while leaders do the right things." I believe that is one way to consider the distinction between two words that are often used interchangeably in the literature of our field. But I would like to suggest another way to view these terms in different ways, and also make the point of how we might also begin to think in terms of an approach to leadership which may offer some hope for solutions to the dilemmas I have selected, but also for other themes and problems that we may identify over time.

A close friend of mine is a very good school administrator. She is the principal of an elementary school in the United States. We have known each other for more than 10 years, and during that time, I have come to be quite aware of the great skills that she possesses as a strong and capable manager. She knows how to organize every aspect of her school so that the pupils are able to work effectively with teachers. She knows how to manage the budget, she is aware of legal matters, teacher bargaining issues, and so forth. In short, she is the type of person who knows how to do things right.

Recently, my friend learned that she has a life-threatening illness. It is quite serious and we both know that she may die as a result of her sickness. Nevertheless, she persists in her efforts to do things right as a school manager. Several weeks ago, we were discussing matters associated with her world as a school principal. After a while, she stopped this conversation with a thought that was thought-provoking for me, to the extent that I would like to share it with you now, for I believe that it is an excellent example of what I think is the difference between management and leadership. She told me that she always knew that she was quite capable of being a good manager, and that she was able to see what had to be done in her school, and that she saw ways of facing daily issues and problems that surrounded her. Even in the most demanding situations, she was able to look at things in a way that enabled her to work though problems, find solutions, and get things done. But her situation now was forcing her to look with "a different eye" at life. She has come to realize that doing things for the sake of getting things done is somehow not the only thing in life that is important. Her "other eye" that has opened has made her look more closely at many things around her, and realize that so much more in life is quite important beyond simply making certain that bills are paid and that teachers get their supplies and materials, or that parents are informed, and so forth. She now puts her management into a relationship with bigger issues, her own values, a sense of what should be rather than simply what must be. She now lives her life with two eyes, one trained on now, and one trained on what might be. She is an example of a leader and an effective manager because she now can do things right, but she can also see the "Big Picture" concerning what should be done, how, and in what ways which may or may not be consistent with her own ethical and value stance.

What I wish to suggest from this story is that the two eyes of my friend are two eyes of management and leadership, and that this is one very useful way to think about the distinction I think we can make as a way that may help us look at some potential ways of dealing with what might otherwise be called insoluble situations. Others have applied other terms to this concept of seeing more than the issues close at hand. Sergiovanni speaks of "moral leadership" and "value-added leadership." Jerry Starratt and Lynn Beck write increasingly about discovering the caring side of leadership. The term I would apply to this issue is "spirituality of leadership," or the sense that someone can acquire the ability to look at issues that are well beyond the "quick fix" often sought by managers. Leaders are those people who can examine their own sense of rightness or wrongness, judge potential consequences, and follow a course of action because it is the right way to do things, not simply because it will get the job done. I submit to you that, if our goal is to identify a conceptual framework which may help us move to a stage where we can look at the four dilemmas I have selected (and many more similar issues), the construct of leadership as a form of moving beyond and outside of the immediate problems faced by school managers may offer us some insights.

The person who has achieved a spiritual form of leadership, or can see "with both eyes," approaches each dilemma quite differently from other people. As one hears demands for increased effectiveness and productivity, those words are translated quite differently by the manager and the leader. The manager hears production in terms of completion of tasks, or the production of things, as if this might show that a good school is one where all pupils have very high test scores on forms of assessment. The manager seeks immediately to comply with the

expectations of others. The problem is, of course, that those expectations will never be satisfied. High test scores mean that higher scores will be expected in the future.

The leader, by contrast, looks at demands for effectiveness in a very different light. The first question that is asked is not, "What do others expect?" but rather, "What do we expect of ourselves, and how may we attain that set of goals?" It is a matter of looking with the "other eye" once again so that we might appreciate more important goals and expectations. Compliance is not the standard of success in this case, but the pursuit of and attainment of valued objectives. The leader looks first at what is critical and important in terms of immediate values and beliefs, and moves toward the attainment of those goals. The leader does not discount the expectations of others, but he or she does not surrender total control to those values, either. Using both eyes, the leader looks outward to the beliefs of others, and then turns a spiritual eye inward to assess personal beliefs to assess what true productivity and effectiveness might be.

In a similar vein, seeking to provide education in ways that are consistent with the realities of diversity is a matter to be treated differently by managers and leaders. The former group might look at dealing with diversity in purely political terms; someone else wants this to be done, and so we must do it in order to comply with legal mandates. The leader, on the other hand, particularly the leader who has adopted a spiritual approach to his or her task, will look at issues of understanding diversity not as something that *must* be done, but something which *should* be done. The realities of diversity are not an annoying problem, but rather an opportunity to enhance greater learning for everyone associated with the schools. It is not an easy thing necessarily to implement programs and plans which recognize diversity, but it is something which the true leader will quickly appreciate as a feature which makes for a more harmonious school.

Maintaining a moral and ethical focus for practice may be the single issue or dilemma which differentiates between the manager and the leader. The manager does what is needed to get the job done, regardless of consequences or dissonance with a higher set of values. Doing things right often means doing what will not cross a line between actions which might lead to trouble, as contrasted with morally and ethically defensible stances. In our own country, I see many examples of managers of schools making decisions largely on the basis of what is "safe" or minimally acceptable practice according to law.

Again, by contrast, the leader takes a very different stance and approach to decision making that is founded on moral and ethical behavior. It seems that the first thing that one does if one sees "with both eyes" is to consider first the fundamental values and beliefs which should define all subsequent actions. Let me give you an example. Superintendents in the US are people who serve as the chief executive officers of school districts, often organizations which include many individual schools. It is a job which makes great demands on a person's ability to deal with a variety of critical issues and tasks associated with keeping an organization afloat, financially, politically, and so forth. Often superintendents define their roles only in terms of management behavior--do what is needed at a given time to reduce turmoil. In fact, I would have to say that most research into superintendent behavior finds this managerial approach to be the prevailing view. Mind you, you must understand that superintendents have come through the ranks as well. They were once teachers, then usually spent tie as principals, and now they are at the top of school hierarchies. It is a sad comment, but find leaders who are superintendents is often a difficult search. Nevertheless, a few years ago, we did some research to find some individuals who were generally perceived as leaders rather than managers. In our interviews, we found that

the single way in which there were differences between the two groups was in the area of how they made use of a fundamental belief system as a way to drive practice. In case after case, we heard superintendents who were regarded as leaders stating that they viewed their jobs as ways for them to preserve the central mission of schools, namely serving the needs of pupils, as their highest priority. Their ethical and moral stance flowed directly from that one simple notion: Kids come first. Time after time we heard people state that, if that principle were always addressed, other matters fell into place quite easily. These people were leaders; they saw with two eyes. They knew the practical realities, they paid the bills, they worked with labor groups, and so forth. But they never compromised their first value of the needs of children.

Working from a moral and ethical basis is linked quite directly with the fourth dilemma, I believe, namely determining balance between individual rights and collective social order. The manager sets forth primarily to respond to the dictates of collective social order above all. After all, such a stance is usually safe and one will not get into as much trouble by going with large numbers. Only when pushed hard will the manager address the specific needs of the individual who might be abused by the collective call. The leader, on the other hand, is a person who constantly questions which set of rights and demands must take precedence. The needs of individuals may be so idiosyncratic as to damage collective order. On the other hand, there are times when simply responding to majority rule may become a way to deny individual rights as well.

Simply adopting the stance of the leader is not a panacea, and it will not cure the dilemmas. In fact, one might even say that assuming the role of a leader will make the dilemmas become even more complex at times. There are no quick fixes, no easy answers to issues that are

true dilemmas. But the concept of leadership suggested here may be a way to move analysis along to a higher degree.

Let us move to the last goals of the conference in the remaining time that we have, and consider ways in which we might look further at the issue of true leadership as a foundation for dealing effectively with persistent dilemmas. Specifically, in my last few minutes, I wish to look at the ways in which we might consider strategies for arriving at leadership. Let me state here once again that, while I often speak in terms of formal administrative roles such as those of school principals, superintendents, and so forth, when I speak of the kind of leadership that I believe we may seek in order to address dilemmas, that kind of leadership is not confined to people in formal roles in the hierarchy. Teachers are leaders, as well; they must learn the ways of seeing with both eyes, to look around and consider bigger issues and problems. In fact, it will be impossible to deal with the types of dilemmas selected for review here and elsewhere if dealing with those dilemmas is viewed as a solitary responsibility of one person in charge. In some of the work I am now doing, I have been looking at what some writers have referred to as the development of spiritual communities in history, with the appreciation that such groups have been most powerful movers of civilization in many ways. In western European tradition, the monastic communities of ancient times were primary examples of spiritual communities. These organizations relied on three important characteristics: They were driven by a core set of sacred beliefs and sacred reading, they engaged in reflective behavior as a way of life, not as a separation from life, and most importantly, they engaged in life as members of a community. There were strong and consistent patterns of collective effort.

In the same way, if schools are to be successful as true communities, then this same type of mutual acceptance of leadership must be practiced by many rather than a few. I suggest here that a good school is not simply one that has a good leader in charge, but one in which leadership occurs on the part of many.

Let us consider ways in which spiritual leadership, as defined and proposed in my comments, might be allowed to flourish in educational settings. Unlike the example of my friend who came to a personal awareness of her second eye's ability to see more than the present, we cannot expect that some sort of traumatic circumstance will enter the lives of most people, thus creating personal epiphanies in each person in schools. Nor do I think that some sort of mass training program which will demand learning about true leadership will have much positive effect. What I wish to suggest is that, as we examine practices associated with the professional development of educators, we have long assumed that people become ready to step into schools through two traditional methods. They learn the "sacred scripture" of education in academic settings. They enroll in courses at universities; they learn many important things about research findings, theories, history, and so forth. Like the monks of yesterday, there must be this fundamental learning of certain realities. The findings of research presented at this and other similar conferences serve as the foundation for this sacred scripture and academic learning. We have also come to realize and appreciate that learning in the university is not enough to complete the preparation of educators. So we send people out into the field to engage in supervised field experience; they learn by doing but often, contrary to Dewey's suggestion, they do not reflect on that experience in a consistent way. But that is how people are made ready to become educators in most places in this world. They learn academic foundations, and they acquire insights into

basic skills out in the field. In short, we do a fairly good job of ensuring that people will acquire perspectives which parallel those of the manager.

But what about leadership? How can we move forward in that area of critical development? Let me suggest that that is the goal and focus of a traditionally ignored part of professional development for educators. For several years, I have referred to this dimension as the process of individual formation; helping people to become more than technicians of educational practice, but also becoming leaders in the ways described earlier.

What is formation? What are its component elements? How might it fit with the other traditional aspects of educator development? As the diagram of the Tri-Dimensional Approach to Professional Development will note, the elements of formation include such issues as the ability to engage in greater reflectivity on one's practice, similar to the view proposed more than a half century ago by John Dewey when he observed that learning by doing may important, but learning by doing without reflection is not learning.

A second element of personal and professional formation is platform development. Here, I believe is a critical central feature of formation. A platform is a personal statement of one's espoused attitudes, values, and beliefs related to significant educational matters. It is meant to be statement of an individual's "bottom line" principles, the kinds of views that, if violated by conditions in a setting, might cause that person to "throw down the keys" to his job and leave an organization. The issues considered in a platform may (and probably will) vary from person to person, but they may include a person's fundamental views on the primary purpose of education, the desired outcomes of a learning sequence, the nature of learners and teachers, the relationship of the curriculum to broader societal goals, and a whole host of other issues which are imbedded

in the daily behaviors and practices of educators. For years, I have been a very strong proponent of platform articulation as a critical first step in beginning one's career, whether it is as a manager or as a teacher. Simply stated, if a person does not appreciate what he or she stands for in their own mind, how will anyone else know that person? And if no one knows a person, how can one ever be effective. In the analogy I have been using throughout this speech, the platform is a the ability to turn that "second eye" inward, to know oneself as a prelude to further effective activity, and authentic activity.

The "glue" that binds all of the formation process together may be, I believe, the practice of mentoring. Let me first explain what I think mentoring is not. Mentoring is not simply the practice of the wise elder or sage telling a younger or inexperienced protege how to do things, what to do, and so forth. Such forms of learning are truly important, but I would classify that more properly as an apprenticeship model, and that is part of the clinical or field-based dimension. Mentors are very special people who may be able to assist apprentices, but they do much more. They help people focus on personal values and self understanding. They are special teachers who draw out the personalized ability of their colleagues to use their "second eye" and understand what individual core values are to be. They are able to lead people through highly personalized journeys of discovery. If this sounds like a very difficult task, you are right. Few people have the personalities, self management abilities, or self confidence to be in the giving role of mentor. And yet, the fact is that there seem to be mentors available in many lives. Few of us would be here today if we had not had such people in our lives.

The final institutional aspect of this issue that I share concerns the nature of the university's role in this process. It seems to me that a legitimate function of universities might be,

in addition to the primary responsibility of providing the academic preparation leg of the triangle, but it may the constant search for mentors, the search for proper and effective likely matches between mentors and mentees, and perhaps the training of people with the type of process and communication skills which might serve to enhance the mentoring capacities of individuals with this gift and talent.

My time with you is nearly over. I conclude my remarks with a hope that some of what I have said today may be of some value in your quest both individually and collectively to find the "other eye" and improve practice as you work toward dealing with the many dilemmas that we all face as educators. Again, thank you for this wonderful opportunity to meet and interact with a whole continent full of new colleagues.

REFERENCES

Beck, Lynn, & Murphy, Joseph (1994). *Educational Administration as a caring profession.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bennis, Warren & Nanus, Burt (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper and Row.

Dewey, John (1938). *Experience and education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

For a more complete treatment of topics presented here, particularly regarding the Tri Dimensional Model of Professional Development or the concept of platforms in education, it is suggested that one consult: Daresh, J. C. & Playko, M. A. (1992). *Professional Development of School Administrators.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, or Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1994). *Supervision as a proactive process: Concepts and cases.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. (A new book which focuses on the concepts in this paper is currently in development by John Daresh for Merrill/Macmillan and should be available in 1997).